

Date: Tue, 21 Jun 94 04:30:14 PDT  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #276  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Tue, 21 Jun 94                      Volume 94 : Issue    276

Today's Topics:

                    440 in So. Cal. (2 msgs)  
         Existing regulations limit our advancem

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----  
Date: Tue, 21 Jun 1994 03:37:00 EST  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!wariat.org!amcomp!  
dan@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: 440 in So. Cal.  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

rogjd@netcom.com (Roger Buffington) writes:

>Dan Pickersgill (dan@amcomp.com) wrote:  
>  
>: >Come on, Jay. You knew that.  
>  
>: I hope YOU knew THAT Roger.  
>  
>: Dan N8PKV  
>: --  
>Well of course I did. I'm the one who wrote it, remember?  
>  
>Now, do YOU understand that the FCC, which requires all amateurs to  
>observe "good amateur practice" considers adherence to coordination  
>(including forgoing interfering with a coordinated station) to BE "good

>amateur practice?

Pardon me for being rude;

"Huh???"

If I understand the question, interference is covered specifically in Part 97 (including repeater to repeater interference) the catch all of "good amateur practice" does not need to be invoked regarding interference. Coordination is the FCC's way, IMO, to have amateurs reduce amateur to amateur interference. The "BAND PLAN" is good amateur practice (the FCC defined that one for me).

If I misunderstood your question I appologize. Could you please rephrase if so and I will try again.

73,

Dan

--

"Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God! I know not what course others may take, but as for me, GIVE ME LIBERTY, OR GIVE ME DEATH!" -Patrick Henry, Virginia House of Burgesses on March 23,1775  
=+=+=> Ted Kennedy's car has killed more people than my gun! - Me

-----

Date: Tue, 21 Jun 1994 03:12:00 EST

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!wariat.org!amcomp!

dan@network.ucsd.edu

Subject: 440 in So. Cal.

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

md@pstc3.pstc.brown.edu (Michael P. Deignan) writes:

>dan@amcomp.com (Dan Pickersgill) writes:

>

>> "So, in essence, a coordinated repeater can have exclusive use of a frequency pair in relation to other coordinated repeaters."

>

>> Part 97.101 (b) says;

>

>> "Each station license and each control operator must cooperate in selecting transmitting channels and in making the most effective use of the amateur service frequencies. \*No frequency shall be assigned for the exclusive use of any station.\*" (emphs added)

>

>Please quote me the relevant part of Part 97 which states that a coordinating body must coordinate more than one repeater on a repeater frequency pair.

Since I never said that why do you expect me to defend that comment?

>A coordinating body may decide, as a policy rule, not to coordinate more than one machine per frequency pair. Therefore, in relation to any other "coordinated" repeater, that repeater has exclusive use of that frequency.

No, it does not. It says that the repeater has exclusive rights to coordination by that coordination organization. Not exclusive rights to a frequency. Exclusive rights can NOT be given to a particular station as that violates Part 97.101.

>(I'll repeat it once more so you can understand, since you appear to be doing the same thing you're accusing me of - not reading or not understanding. Please read carefully:)

>

>This does not mean that the repeater has exclusive use of the frequency in relation to other amateur stations, simply in relation to other repeaters coordinated by that coordinating body. Anybody can use the frequencies simplex or set up an uncoordinated machine if they so desire.

You said "Therefore, in relation to any other "coordinated" repeater, that repeater has exclusive use of that frequency." Exclusive use of a frequency is a direct violation of Part 97.101 in relation to ANT type of station. Exclusive use is NOT PERMITTED. As to simplex on a repeater pair it is a violation, also of Part 97.101.

>> >My statement stands, and is correct. In relation to other coordinated repeaters, a repeater can have exclusive use of a frequency because a coordinating body may decide not to coordinate more than one machine per frequency.

>

>> Coordination does NOT equal exclusive use. You are wrong again. Why not just give up instead of PROVING how wrong you can be.

>

>Please contemplate the following phrase: IN RELATION TO OTHER COORDINATED REPEATERS...

>

>Since a coordinating body may only coordinate one repeater per pair, that body has decided the exclusive issue for you, haven't they.

They still do not have exclusive use of anything except the coordination from THAT PARTICULAR body, certainly NOT exclusive use of the frequency.

>> This is WRONG as it is directly a violation of part 97! You can NOT give exclusive use to any station.

>

>WRONG! IN RELATION TO OTHER COORDINATED REPEATERS.

You confuse coordination with frequencies. You are right, the theory tests are badly in need of updating if you are making that mistake. A frequency is a particular part of the electromagnetic spectrum. A coordination is a paper issued by a coordinating body. They are not analogous. If you insist calling an apple an orange don't expect me (or others) to understand. Again you deliberately miss state things to argue. Read a good book on electronics before you continue to argue that coordination is a frequency. I suggest Now You're Talking by the ARRL. After you finish that come back, you MAY have an intelligent comment to make (I doubt it, but stranger things have happened. Clinton got elected president, anything is possible).

Now repeater W1W is coordinated by the Ohio Coordination Group, next door N1N is coordinated by the US Coordination Council. Both on the same frequency, both coordinated, both legal, both coordinated on the same day at the same exact second. Which one has (in your words) "inated" repeater, that repeater has exclusive use of that frequency. Which repeater has, in your words, "exclusive use of that frequency" in relation to the other, coordinated, repeater?

Guess what, you're wrong again, but you knew that already. (Or is it brain damage from beeping at yourself?)

Dan

--

"Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God! I know not what course others may take, but as for me, GIVE ME LIBERTY, OR GIVE ME DEATH!" -Patrick Henry, Virginia House of Burgesses on March 23, 1775  
=+=+=> Ted Kennedy's car has killed more people than my gun! - Me

-----

Date: Tue, 21 Jun 1994 01:44:09 GMT

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!news.moneng.mei.com!uwm.edu!mixcom.com!kevin.jessup@network.ucsd.edu

Subject: Existing regulations limit our advancement

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In <2u4ubt\$1ur@abyss.West.Sun.COM> myers@spot.West.Sun.COM (Dana Myers ) writes:

>I'm not saying we shouldn't use amateur radio for many purposes, I'm just  
>pointing out the danger of making amateur radio too appealing as an  
>alternative to the other commercial radio services.

Currently, IMO, there is NO danger! ; -)

I'll limit my use of digital encryption: the cypher key is only known to members of the "closed digital repeater club". And, obviously, the system trustee. There also is a bit of a difference between using a "somewhat secure" autopatch for a rare call to your boss and REGULARLY conducting daily business operations over the same patch. I see no reason, even today, why you should not be able to use the autopatch to tell your boss you're stuck in a traffic jam. Such an occurrence is relatively minor and is not enhancing or benefitting the employer's operations on a regular basis.

I don't see a great deal of difference in using the patch to order a pizza or calling a financial institution (or your family physician) to set up an appointment. Again, I am assuming a digital system here, used on a more or less closed basis among members of a private repeater club.

What if direct sequence spread spectrum repeaters and radios (or CDMA) were a reality for amateur radio? Think of what a private repeater club could do if the radios had a user configurable spreading code (pseudo noise). Trouble with a regular jammer? Change everyone's radio and the repeater to the new code at the next meeting.

While hams who were NOT members could not monitor the signal, it would still be the responsibility of the system control operator, trustee and the regular users to abide by the rules of amateur radio.

Basically, I am in favor of relaxing the rules to the point where there would be greater demand for integrating a variety of services such as digitized voice, voice mail, paging, etc AMONG THE AMATEUR COMMUNITY and perhaps immediate family members. I am not at all in favor of opening this up to every small businessman who passes the no-code technician test!

>>In the first few paragraphs of the initial post, I referred to integrated >>digital systems from cellular carriers. I guess when I broke up the >>amateur equivalent into individual examples, it was not obvious that I >>was referring to integrated digital amateur systems to accomplish all >>of the given examples. Sorry about that.

>OK... it might be interesting for amateurs to demonstrate integrated >voice/data services via a cellular infrastructure. If so, we better >hurry... :-)

In all honesty, I don't think we CAN catch up. Assuming we (as a whole) cannot catch up or remain technically competent, should the technology (and associated band space) be allowed to "trickle down" to radio amateurs

as the cost of these systems drop?

>>Again, why do you not make this same argument for every other aspect  
>>of amateur radio. Why are integrated digital service bad but anything  
>>analog is good?

>I'm not arguing against integrated voice/data services. I'm suggesting that  
>Part 97 forbids us from using amateur radio as an alternative to other  
>appropriate radio services. If you want to yak with non-amateurs, there's  
>cellular telephones.

I was making the reverse autopatch analogy. So long as a licensed radio  
amateur is involved, I feel it should be allowed. If my wife wants to  
contact me via some amateur network, I feel it is ok. If she want's to  
call someone else who, like her, does NOT have a licence, then it should  
NOT be allowed.

Thanks for your comments, Dana.

--

/`- _	kevin.jessup@mixcom.com		Vote Libertarian!
{	}		
\	/		Call 1-800-682-1776
__*	N9SQB @ WA9POV.#MKE.WI.USA.NA		for more information.

-----

Date: Tue, 21 Jun 1994 04:12:00 EST  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!wariat.org!amcomp!  
dan@network.ucsd.edu  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <215.364.1442.0NA70318@megasystem.com>,  
<1994Jun20.134628.27534@mixcom.mixcom.com>, <2u4l5i\$snq@agate.berkeley.edu>  
Subject : Re: CW - THE ONLY MODE!

kennish@kabuki.EECS.Berkeley.EDU (Ken A. Nishimura) writes:

{SNIP}

>Thus, the truth is, OOK or CW is NOT the most efficient manner in  
>terms of power (and is not the most spectrally efficient either), but  
>in terms of sending and receiving complexity, it is by far the simplest,  
>thus accounting for its popularity. (Fiber optics make use of OOK  
>all the time for the same reason.)  
>

>  
>

-Ken

Hummmm, UC at Berkeley? Why am I not suprised with the origin of this post? Thank you Ken. You did a thousand times better explaining that then I could have even dreamed!

73,

Dan

--

"Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God! I know not what course others may take, but as for me, GIVE ME LIBERTY, OR GIVE ME DEATH!" -Patrick Henry, Virginia House of Burgesses on March 23,1775  
==+=+=> Ted Kennedy's car has killed more people than my gun! - Me

-----

Date: Tue, 21 Jun 1994 07:17:28 GMT  
From: news.Hawaii.Edu!kahuna!jeffrey@ames.arpa  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <Cr5AEn.A9t@cup.hp.com>, <CrM7An.KA@news.Hawaii.Edu>,  
<1994Jun20.142132.14632@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>, ó  
Subject : Re: Question about Radar Jamming

In article <1994Jun20.142132.14632@ke4zv.atl.ga.us> gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman) writes:

>In article <CrM7An.KA@news.Hawaii.Edu> jherman@uhunix.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu (Jeffrey Herman) writes:

>>It's no wonder auto insurance is so costly in SoCal with lunatics like this  
>>on the road. Why be so proud about breaking the law? Stay under the speed  
>>limit and save a life or two.

>>

>>Jeff NH6IL (an ex-fireman from SoCal who has seen, many dozens of times, the  
>>end result of a speeding motorist fly through a windshield at  
>>70 mph. Quite nauseating to have to pick up the pieces.)

>

>You \*should\* know then that the roads with the highest speed limits have  
>the lowest fatality rates.

Really? Not in the county I worked. Orange County is not Hicksville, GA with a hundred mile stretch of road and cactus. Our roads with the highest speeds are crowded freeways with speeding motorists weaving between one lane and another. The end result is always a mess with broken bodies. Ever see someone with their steering column through their chest? The CHP estimated he was going 90+. He killed a family

of four in the car he hit. In another speeding incident the driver was decapitated; that was the first TC (but not the last) where I vomitted when we returned to the fire station.

You can take your 'facts' and your radar detector and shove them up your okole (look that up in a Hawaiian dictionary). In your selfish desire to justify speeding you've forgotten about the innocent lives that you'll kill or maim when you eventually have an accident. Feel free to speed into a tree or a guardrail or a cement column on a freeway but do try to avoid the other motorists.

Jeff NH6IL (jeffrey@math.hawaii.edu)

-----  
Date: Tue, 21 Jun 1994 04:16:00 EST  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!wariat.org!amcomp!  
dan@network.ucsd.edu  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <215.364.1442.0NA70318@megasystem.com>,  
<062094101728Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>, <CrpwG2.Lot@news.Hawaii.Edu>,  
Subject : Re: CW - THE ONLY MODE!

jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman) writes:

>I'm curious about something that might seem completely unrelated to the  
>code vs no-code debate: Most 4-year colleges/universities still require  
>2 years of a foreign language. Those of you who believe that code is  
>outdated and/or shouldn't be given the present weight it enjoys on  
>the amateur exams, please ask yourself the following: Is this 2-year  
>foreign language requirement outdated in that there are other necessary  
>skills required for students to master in order to be ready for today's  
>work-force upon graduation?

>  
So you are saying that wetware morse decryption is unrelated to amateur  
radio and RF in general (the degree) and is added to the curriculum  
(testing) to add breadth? What an admission Jeff!

>No need to respond to the net, but I would bet my terminal that there is  
>a corrolation in viewpoints with regard to the two above-mentioned  
>'unrelated' topics.

Sorry my friend, I just had too!!! :-)

Dan

--

"Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price



of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God! I know not what course others may take, but as for me, GIVE ME LIBERTY, OR GIVE ME DEATH!" -Patrick Henry, Virginia House of Burgesses on March 23,1775  
=+=+=> Ted Kennedy's car has killed more people than my gun! - Me

-----  
Date: Tue, 21 Jun 1994 03:58:00 EST  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!wariat.org!amcomp!  
dan@network.ucsd.edu  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <061994105340Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>, <58+Tg+j.edellers@delphi.com>, <2u5i8n\$352@ccnet.ccnet.com>  
Subject : Re: 440 in So. Cal.

rwilkins@ccnet.com (Bob Wilkins n6fri) writes:

>Ed Ellers (edellers@delphi.com) wrote:  
>: Dan Pickersgill <dan@amcomp.com> writes:  
>:  
>: >Ed, you keep insisting to use the term 'open' on a policy forum. There is  
>: >no such thing as an open repeater. I seriously doubt that ANY trustee  
>: >would allow his repeater to be truly 'open'.  
>: >  
>: >Since there is little difference between what you refer to as 'open' and  
>: >'closed', and NO league difference, I can't see why you insist on using  
>: >that ters (as it is very misleading and inaccurate).  
>:  
>: Then I guess the dozen or so carrier-operated, no-tone-needed repeaters I'm  
>: able to use in the Louisville area -- with no prior consent needed from the  
>: licensees -- don't really exist, huh?  
>  
>I find your policy discussion quite amusing as there are several local  
>repeaters listed as closed in the directory that run in the carrier  
>squellch mode most of the time.

Just what I said. Open refers to carrier operated squellch.

>Maybe the only repeaters that are open are the repeaters that have no  
>squellch circuit at all. Just a lot of white noise punctuated by the  
>babbings from Dan. You must agree the squellch circuit closes the  
>repeater.

No, the squellch circuit closes the RECIEVER, not the repeater. Wanna try again? You'll loose!

>OH WELL .... Just trying for the perfect squellch ;)

```
>: Did you know that the ARRL RULE BOOK points out that ALL repeater
>: operators can limit access to their repeater? (That in effect, there is no
>: such thing as an "open repeater".)
```

>  
>: Now we can use the term 'open' correctly , to mean a carrier operated  
>: squelch system.  
>  
>:  
>: Dan N8PKV  
>: --  
>  
>Wrong. Quite simply, wrong. That's not what it means at all. "Closed"  
>in the book means exactly what those in this thread have claimed it  
>meant: i.e. restricted access of one type or another.

Part of my commets that you deleted said

c - Closed, private system

Which of those three words did you not understand?

I said "OPEN" refers to "usually carrier squelch". How you got from there  
to a comment about closed not meaning private I do not know since I said  
EXACTLY that. A closed system means PRIVATE. See above from your quote of  
my comments.

Dan

--

"Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price  
of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God! I know not what  
course others may take, but as for me, GIVE ME LIBERTY, OR GIVE ME  
DEATH!" -Patrick Henry, Virginia House of Burgesses on March 23,1775  
==+=> Ted Kennedy's car has killed more people than my gun! - Me

-----

Date: Tue, 21 Jun 1994 03:32:00 EST

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!wariat.org!amcomp!  
dan@network.ucsd.edu

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <2u3aea\$ggf@chnews.intel.com>, <062094095031Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>,  
<2u4g5u\$eiu@ccnet.ccnet.com>,  
Subject : Re: 440 in So. Cal.

rwilkins@ccnet.com (Bob Wilkins n6fri) writes:

>Dan Pickersgill (dan@amcomp.com) wrote:

>:

>: NOTES - How repeaters may be accessed and other specialized features are  
>: indicated by the following abbreviations:

>  
>: o - open (usually carrier-operated)  
>: bi - Bi-lingual  
>: c - Closed, private system  
>: t - Tone-access (CTCSS tone) tone required to access.  
>: Standard EIA are listed on page 54.  
>: tt - Touch-Tone access to specialized repeater functions.  
>:  
>: End Quote.  
>:  
>  
>: Did you know that the ARRL RULE BOOK points out that ALL repeater  
>: operators can limit access to their repeater? (That in effect, there is no  
>: such thing as an "open repeater".)  
>  
>: Now we can use the term 'open' correctly , to mean a carrier operated  
>: squelch system.  
>  
>There are hundreds of OPEN repeaters here in California breaking Your  
>law. This is a matter of local policy. These OPEN repeater groups have  
>found that using ctcss tone access they can limit access to Any amateur  
>that wants to access just Their repeater and not another near by repeater.  
>  
>I sure hope Your policy would allow good OPEN repeaters that have  
>operated in the finest tradition to enhance their operations by using  
>state of the art technology to limit access to only those stations  
>wishing to use the repeater.  
>  
>What is Your policy on CLOSED repeaters that list their ctcss tone?  
>  
>I would suggest that ctcss tone access does not close a repeater, it  
>enhances the operation of the repeater for everyone.  
>  
>Dan I have allways felt that open and closed were too limiting in  
>describing the operating characteristics of the repeater group. Would you  
>care to add any new designators or definitions to repeater access that  
>would make it clear to an average amateur user of repeaters.  
>  
>Your logic seems to indicate that all public roads are closed as there is  
>a speed limit.  
>  
>Bob

You carefully deleted the part where I said I was QUOTING the ARRL  
repeater directory, in response to a comment about the repeater directory.  
I made no comments about MY policy or MY way of doing things in the  
message you quoted. My comments pertained to MY opinion of the ARRL  
publication and their way of describing things. Please read more

carefully before you post.

By the way, your editing of my post to try and get me to say something I did not was well attempted. However, IMHO, I think you failed, but there is always next time.

Dan

--

"Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God! I know not what course others may take, but as for me, GIVE ME LIBERTY, OR GIVE ME DEATH!" -Patrick Henry, Virginia House of Burgesses on March 23,1775  
==> Ted Kennedy's car has killed more people than my gun! - Me

-----

Date: Tue, 21 Jun 1994 07:42:47 GMT  
From: news.Hawaii.Edu!kahuna!jeffrey@ames.arpa  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <Cr5AEn.A9t@cup.hp.com>, <CrM7An.KA@news.Hawaii.Edu>,  
<1994Jun20.142132.14632@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>, ó  
Subject : Re: Question about Radar Jamming

In article <1994Jun20.142132.14632@ke4zv.atl.ga.us> gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman) writes:

> Despite government propaganda, speed doesn't kill,  
> it's those sudden stops that get you.

What a comical statement. Those sudden stops wouldn't be so sudden if one weren't speeding.

> Most fatalities occur within 10 miles  
> of home, on surface streets, at speeds of less than 40 MPH, caused by people  
> failing to pay attention to traffic, often because they're drunk.

Tell that to the commuters on the SoCal freeways - many of whom drive over 120 miles each day - sober.

> Buy a clue,

Better idea: Ride along with a paramedic team in one of your larger cities rather than spewing these 'averages'. While you were sitting home reading your magazines I was out on those roads trying to piece speeders back together again. On one TC we spent 45 minutes searching a field beside the freeway for an arm. CHP estimated he was traveling 95 on the offramp.

>55 MPH speed limits on roads engineered for 70 MPH are going to be ignored by  
>a sizable fraction of drivers.

May they rest in peace.

Jeff NH6IL (jeffrey@math.hawaii.edu)

-----

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #276

\*\*\*\*\*